

NOTICE: THIS DECISION DOES NOT CREATE LEGAL PRECEDENT AND  
MAY NOT BE CITED EXCEPT AS AUTHORIZED BY APPLICABLE RULES.  
*See* Ariz. R. Supreme Court 111(c); ARCAP 28(c); Ariz. R. Crim. P. 31.24

FILED BY CLERK

APR -1 2011

COURT OF APPEALS  
DIVISION TWO

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS  
STATE OF ARIZONA  
DIVISION TWO

THE STATE OF ARIZONA,	)	2 CA-CR 2010-0209
	)	DEPARTMENT B
Appellee,	)	
	)	<u>MEMORANDUM DECISION</u>
v.	)	Not for Publication
	)	Rule 111, Rules of
JU'JUAN MARQUETTE GIBSON,	)	the Supreme Court
	)	
Appellant.	)	
_____	)	

APPEAL FROM THE SUPERIOR COURT OF PIMA COUNTY

Cause No. CR20094200001

Honorable John S. Leonardo, Judge

AFFIRMED

\_\_\_\_\_  
Barton & Storts, P.C.  
By Brick P. Storts, III

Tucson  
Attorneys for Appellant

\_\_\_\_\_  
ECKERSTROM, Judge.

¶1 After a jury trial, appellant Ju’Juan Gibson was convicted of two counts each of armed robbery and aggravated assault and one count of aggravated robbery, all dangerous-nature offenses. The trial court sentenced him to concurrent terms of imprisonment, some mitigated and some presumptive, the longest of which is 7.5 years. Counsel has filed a brief pursuant to *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), and *State v. Clark*, 196 Ariz. 530, 2 P.3d 89 (App. 1999), avowing he has reviewed the entire record and found no arguable legal issues to raise on appeal. Consistent with *Clark*, 196 Ariz. 530, ¶ 32, 2 P.3d at 97, he has provided “a detailed factual and procedural history of the case with citations to the record,” and asks this court to search the record for fundamental error. Gibson has not filed a supplemental brief.

¶2 We conclude substantial evidence supported the jury’s verdicts. See A.R.S. §§ 13-1203(A)(2), 13-1204(A)(2)<sup>1</sup>, 13-1902, 13-1903(A), 13-1904(A); see also *State v. Tamplin*, 195 Ariz. 246, ¶ 2, 986 P.2d 914, 914 (App. 1999) (evidence viewed in light most favorable to sustaining jury verdict). In sum, two men demanded cash at gunpoint from tellers working at a bank branch located in a Tucson grocery store. Both tellers gave the men marked “bait money,” and passed along tracking devices, one of which assisted police in apprehending Gibson and his co-defendant, each of whom was carrying the bank’s identifiable currency in his pockets. Our review of Gibson’s sentences confirms they were within the range authorized and were imposed in a lawful manner. See A.R.S. § 13-704(A).

---

<sup>1</sup>The version of § 13-1204 in effect at the time Gibson committed the offenses is the same in relevant part. See 2008 Ariz. Sess. Laws, ch. 301, § 52.

¶3 In our examination of the record pursuant to *Anders*, we have found no fundamental or reversible error and no arguable issue warranting further appellate review. *See* 386 U.S. at 744. Accordingly, we affirm Gibson’s convictions and sentences.

/s/ *Peter J. Eckerstrom*  
PETER J. ECKERSTROM, Judge

CONCURRING:

/s/ *Virginia C. Kelly*  
VIRGINIA C. KELLY, Judge

/s/ *Philip G. Espinosa*  
PHILIP G. ESPINOSA, Judge